Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VII, No. 35, *Issue Number* 344, AUGUST 30, 1950 *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIV. OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED SEP 6 1950 LIBRARY

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

by Edna Lonigan

The gradual unfolding of the Soviet scheme to bleed us to defeat, by a series of little wars with her satellites, makes it essential that we have a thorough re-examination of the Marshall Plan.

It is now fairly well accepted that the Berlin airlift was a military feint planned by the Soviets, to keep our eyes on Europe while they completed the last steps in their carefully planned defeat of Free China. Today we need to ask whether the Marshall Plan was a gigantic diversion, to keep us from rearming Europe, for the three critical years in which they consolidated their position in Asia. The circumstances, viewed in the changed light of today, are extremely suspicious.

After an era of "good feeling", in which we spent billions for relief through UNRRA, and other agencies which were heavily staffed with Communists, the President suddenly announced, on March 12, 1947, that we were done with appeasement of the Soviet Union. The Communists were threatening Greece and Turkey with armed force through their satellites, and that touched our security. We would now resist the further spread of Communism by force with military and financial aid to the threatened nations. This was the famous Truman Doctrine -- for the military containment of Communism. Economic aid was to be strictly limited to the main purpose -- opposing the extension of Soviet power with arms.

Where is the Truman Doctrine now? It is dead and gone. Apart from its application to Greece and Turkey, and in the case of the Korean intervention, the formula was not used elsewhere. Instead we shifted to the exact reverse, or aid for economic recovery, without any military protection to nations in the Russian line of march.

When did we decide to abandon the Truman Doctrine of military containment of Communism, and shift to the direct opposite? Obviously with the Marshall Plan. But the Marshall Plan was never debated openly as abandonment of the Truman Doctrine. It was supported rather as a better way of containing Communism, by reducing internal Communist rebellion. A few "reactionary" Congressmen kept saying that economic aid without military protection was fattening the goose for the kill. Congressman Judd, for example, asked time after time the question, "Why should we expect the Communists to keep out of Western Europe (or Korea, or Siam) when our investment of billions only makes those countries more tempting?" But these men could not be heard because of the propaganda din.

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the announcement of the Truman Doctrine, Soviet fortunes were at a low ebb. Truman had said they could advance no farther in the West. Chiang Kai-shek had always been for the Truman Doctrine of meeting force with force. Soon the ring would begin to close. But in three years the Communists have recovered all their lost ground. They have captured China, threatened India, Southeast Asia and Japan, and set their satellite armies in motion in Korea. We have spent over $60 billion on foreign aid, over $90 billion for defense, but our soldiers do not have armor and our cities are making plans for protection against bombing. How was this transformation brought about?

Let us go back to 1947 and ask -- what did the Soviet leaders do when the Truman Doctrine was announced? Obviously they did not contemplate stopping it by open attack. They undoubtedly looked over the chessboard and calculated their next move. They knew they possessed a fifth column in our Government, and they had a powerful fifth column in the agencies that influenced public opinion in the United States. How should they use them?

Well, what would better serve their purpose than a bigger and better spending program, with vague, inflated global objectives, from which they had quietly extracted the teeth? It would help spend us into bankruptcy and make us an eagle without claws; a paper tiger. Meanwhile, they could complete their rearmament, including the atomic bomb. This must have been the Kremlin's thinking.

In June, 1947, we had the first formal announcement of the Marshall Plan. Who announced it? General Marshall, who as Ambassador had gone to China aided by pro-Communist advisers, and had furthered the Soviet policy of weakening the armies of Free China, while Russia built up the Communist forces. He had been made Secretary of State (after Byrnes, who turned against the Communists, had been removed). Who was the reputed author of the Marshall Plan? Well, there have been many names mentioned. But one is that of Dean Acheson, then Under Secretary of State. We need not expand.

We have, then, the following chain of facts. The Truman Doctrine was announced with great fanfare, put into effect in one corner of Europe, but elsewhere sunk without a trace. It was replaced by a plan for economic aid without military protection that gave Stalin three precious years in which to protect his flank in Asia, and to prepare for war. The new program was put forward by the officials responsible for the sell-out in China, and supported by the New Deal Communist propa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ganda arm. It was, of course, opposed by Marcantonio and the Daily Worker. But wasn't that because the Communist plotters thought it the best way to make us believe they were opposed to it?

III

Thousands of good people voted for and worked for the Marshall Plan, for good reasons. They did not see that every Communist "booby trap" is wrapped up in a "good" program.

The Truman Doctrine was based on the hard fact -- recognized all too late -- that nations which fell victims to Soviet aggression had all been destroyed by force. No nation except Russia has adopted Communism because of genuine uprising of the poor and needy.

The Communists merely took out the old illusion that Communism sprang from social discontent, dusted it off, attached it to a bigger spending program, added some new economic arguments, and sold it to the American people. This argument has been used so often and so successfully by Communist agents that anyone who repeats it today is helping Stalin's fifth column.

ECA was sold to Americans as a plan to "raise" the standard of living in Europe. But common sense should have told us that 150 million Americans could not raise the standard of living of 250 million Europeans, who had wasted the capital of generations in war, who had lost their natural markets in Asia, and who were adding millions of hungry new mouths a year to a continent which was already dangerously overpopulated in 1900.

We should have been warned by the rapid recovery Europe had already made. We should have seen that we had many ways to help Europe, that had worked effectively after the First World War. They included war relief like Herbert Hoover's after 1918, recovery and rehabilitation by churches and foundations, commercial loans, and the new long-term loans of the International Bank for Reconstruction.

Why did not the American people realize they were being deceived? Because a nation with a powerful State and ruling party propaganda cannot think for itself. People may doubt what the propagandists say, but they cannot formulate their thoughts nor effectively voice them.

Why did not President Truman complain at the sabotage of his doctrine? Because he is a prisoner of the palace guard, surrounded by people who are either committed to the Communist cause, or believe it is the winning side, or are willing to close their eyes to its camouflaged activities, because it delivers the extra votes needed to keep the Fair New Deal in power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fifth column in our State Department, the fifth column in the ruling Democratic Party organization, and the fifth column in our press and radio, and their naive dupes (notably the GOP bipartisanites), did the work Russia wanted done.

IV

It is no longer possible for responsible Americans to accept the case for ECA. Probably ECA reduced the popular following of the Communists in Western Europe, though it did nothing to reduce the hard core of disciplined Party members. It diverted Europe from its problem of military security with dreams of ease and prosperity. At home it diverted our minds from Asia, where the struggle for the world will be decided. It diverted our minds from the problems of rearmament and made deficit spending permanent in peacetime. We have MAP -- on paper -- it is true, but is MAP so far anything but sound and fury?

What can we do in place of ECA? Senator Byrd has already pointed out that it is folly for us to build up Europe's peacetime economy, when we are cutting back our own. It is politically and sentimentally impossible to abandon ECA. But we can insist on prompt amendment of the ECA Act to apply the test of military priority to every project, in every country now under the Marshall Plan. Projects which help rearmament in the short-run should be kept. Projects conceived under the illusion that rich farms, good roads, large factories and power plants will keep the Russians away should be stopped as of now.

The abandoned Truman Doctrine has been a complete success. Without military aid, Greece and Turkey, now free, would both have suffered the fate of Korea. If we had followed the Truman Doctrine in China, China today would be free.

In the struggle for survival it is not enough to be kind-hearted. The contest with the Soviet system has been almost entirely a war of wits. We have been continuously on the losing side. The Communists use soldiers and arms for counters but they move them on the world chessboard by using their brains. It is necessary for America to be intelligent, more intelligent than those who would destroy us.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 35

By Frank C. Hanighen August 30, 1950

MacARTHUR AND TRUMAN: The affray between the President and the General may prove a major political event before many months, but you would not suspect it judging by the sayings of many tame commentators. Some editorial writers and radio commentators have applied the soothing explanation, "There's no fundamental difference between the views of the two men." Actually, a very sharp difference emerges from the statements and letters of both. The President wants to play it (the Formosa problem) within the halls of that international liability, the United Nations. MacArthur wants Formosa kept as part of our strategic defense system, no matter what the UN says. The President keeps open a way for another of his diplomatic messes in the not too distant future -- with the U.S.A. cast in the role of a violator of the UN principles by defending the vital island. The Washington Times-Herald hit the nail on the head (August 30), remarking editorially: "Mr. Truman has jockeyed himself into the position where we are the agent of UN in one nasty war while UN stands to disavow us in another even nastier."

So far as the average citizen of the U.S. is concerned, MacArthur has performed a big service for him -- by breaking down the Administration's habit of using the military for political purposes. That isn't the way it is usually explained to the citizen. The lickspittles of the Administration always raise a great hue and cry of "the military shouldn't intervene in politics", if any admiral or general shows a disposition to tell Congress the truth. The Democratic Administration has a custom of keeping the military from telling the truth publicly, and of profiting from the enforced silence -- the while White House pundits make prevaricating military analyses. MacArthur has broken this down by giving the people what they rightfully should hear -- a frank analysis of a situation that affects their security.

The whole affair cannot help but have repercussions on the approaching election. It is as plain as a pikestaff that MacArthur defied Truman and that the President had to take it lying down. Truman knew well he couldn't relieve the commander of our forces in the Korean war. Unless the people are completely blinded by the soothing syrup in the press, MacArthur must loom as their protector and the President's already Lilliputian stature must diminish measurably. Since MacArthur is not a political contestant himself in the campaign, the logical outcome of the past week's affair should be a severe setback to the Democratic chances.

* * * * *

ACHESON: Privately Democratic circles are speculating with keen interest about the results of the MacArthur affair on Acheson's status: conservatives perceiving hope that, as a consequence, he will resign before the election; Fair Dealers gloomily conceding that may happen. Certainly MacArthur has figuratively slapped Acheson's face, in a move by a military commander such as has not been seen since "the generals' crisis" days of the North in the Civil War. Some here wonder if Acheson will not insist that the President accept his resignation; but there is no certainty of such an event. Surely no Secretary of State has ever suffered such public humiliation and remained in office.

If he should step out, Republicans would rejoice. From the standpoint of a point-by-point partisan campaign battle, they would have ample reason. However, the concentration of fire on Acheson, the man, and the demand that he resign carries the implication that, if he were gone, all would be well in the State Department. The fact of the matter is that the infiltration into the Department is deep, and for any lasting reform of our foreign policy it will have to be thoroughly cleansed.

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For instance, just the other day we received, from a source in a position to know, the news that certain bureaucrats have recently been assigned to the U.S. Occupation administration in Germany, to help shape our political policy there. Yet the attitude of those particular officials is best described as a holdover of the Morgenthau Plan days, and is flatly contrary to all the principal policies now being followed by High Commissioner J. J. McCloy. Anyone who is familiar with the power wielded by bureaucrats can realize the sabotage that these officials can accomplish in this critical area. In short, not only must any successor to Acheson be sound himself, but also he must appoint a team which would reach right down into the middle levels of the bureaucracy under him; and his key men must be capable of drastic hiring and firing.

* * * * *

BUSINESSMEN IN GOVERNMENT: Apropos of the above, we note with dismay some bland confidence among American businessmen that any war effort will be headed by men "who enjoy the confidence of American Business". What folly! Time after time, well-meaning and capable (that is, capable in their own line) business figures have entered Government. Hardened old observers here shake their heads over the way these individuals are taken in by subordinates who belong to the New and Fair Deal political gang. Many of these executives wind up completely controlled by artful Left Wing bureaucrats who take advantage of the naivete, vanity and ignorance of the "businessman in government". No businessman should accept such a position unless he enters the jungle of Washington officialdom accompanied by a loyal and intelligent staff that will reach right down into the middle ranks of the bureaucracy which he heads. The other day we heard an appraisal of top businessmen who hold key positions in the Government and it sounds correct to us. Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder rates A in the class; Secretary of Commerce Sawyer about C; and Paul Hoffman of ECA flunks the test.

* * * * *

WORLD MILITARY STRATEGY: General MacArthur has laid down the lines of military policy in the Far East. He has never publicly stated his views on what it should be in Europe. Would it not be useful if a committee of Congressmen were to get his views on MAP (Military Aid Program) for Europe? We learn on good authority that MacArthur has privately (several times in the past few years) expressed the ambition to design American world military policy and the nature of the U.S. military forces necessary to implement it. Would it not be helpful if the American people should receive from their most able general a picture of the potential military power of this country, its capacities and limitations, and a view on the best way of utilizing it to support a reasonable foreign policy? It has been said too often that the military should not intrude in politics -- which is true. But it is time for military men to throw off shackles placed upon them by the partisan political considerations of their civilian superiors; and to tell the American people the facts.

In this connection, MacArthur's statement on Formosa reminds us that his delineation of the essential line of our military policy in the Far East coincides rather closely with General Bonner Fellers' description of what our policy should be in his article, On Cold War, in HUMAN EVENTS (June 7, 1950). This is not strange because Fellers was in charge of planning on MacArthur's staff during a considerable part of the Pacific operations of World War II. Incidentally, General Fellers tells us that an article he has written on what he thinks American world strategy should be has been accepted by a leading magazine for early publication.

* * * * *

SECRETARY MATTHEWS' SPEECH: The other piece of uproar, emanating from our admirably unified armed services, was the speech of Secretary of the Navy Matthews, seeming to urge a preventive war. Now Mr. Matthews is not exactly the type to take such initi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ative on his own, and probably does not deserve the chorus of horrified disapproval which greeted his speech. It is often remarked that Admiral Sherman is the real Secretary of the Navy. Also, observers note that columnist David Lawrence writes: "It is probably a good thing to have the Russian press and the Russian people know that the American people are not sitting idly by while a group of evil men in the Kremlin are considering more aggression in different parts of the world. It may be salutary for the Russian to learn that a democracy is debating counter-measures against allowing an aggressor to take the initiative." Lawrence is believed to be influenced by the hierarchy of the Navy.

What was behind the Secretary's speech? Observers here believe that the Matthews utterance was a trial balloon, released as a result of grave concern in the armed services. It was simply the Navy's turn to carry the ball. The concern arises from the defense services' view that Truman had unfortunately committed our strength to ground force action in Korea; that we have inadequate forces left to take care of any other enemy action in some other area of the world; that we should come to grips directly with Soviet Russia within the next year. It is emphasized that we cannot afford to exhaust our strength against Soviet satellites while Russia gains military power every month. It is estimated that within two years the Soviets should possess atom bombs in sufficient number to wreck our cities and industries. Hence, it is said, we cannot afford to temporize. So much for this view prevalent in the Pentagon. And hence -- it is believed -- the motive behind the Matthews talk.

* * * * *

BOUGHT AND PAID FOR: Our contributor, Frank Chodorov, has sent us the following pertinent observation on a subject much in the news during the past week. As might be expected, Chodorov plucked out the real news in the news. He says: A bill, introduced by Senator Chan Gurney (R., S.D.) and prepared by the Armed Services Committee (according to the New York Herald-Tribune, August 23), authorizes the Army to "draft" more than 4,000 doctors who were educated at Government expense, during World War I, but have never rendered the military services for which they obligated themselves. Only one man in that group, the story goes, has volunteered to serve in the present emergency.

It is reported that the bill will meet with little or no opposition. It has the support of the American Medical Association, whose spokesman maintained before the committee that these doctors have a "moral obligation" to the country that ought to be made legal.

The argument is irrefutable: the Government made it possible for these men to become doctors and is entitled to a recompense. It is a simple matter of contract. Yet the matter should make those who plug for Government subsidization of education sit up and take notice. Does not subvention imply a contractual obligation? A father may not expect anything from the son he sent to college; but can a government, doling out the taxpayer's money, be as generous? Does not that government acquire a "right" to "draft" those it educates? Including atomic scientists, journalists and graduates of the Harvard School of Business?

According to the New York Herald-Tribune, on August 29, "the Senate Committee turned down a military request for registration and possible drafting of scientists and technicians, including chemists and engineers". But it is worthwhile to note the basis for such a rejection. The Senate Committee did not turn down the military on grounds that the principle of "moral obligation" was unsound, but -- as the Herald-Tribune reports -- "on grounds this power is not called for at present." [Our emphasis.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

THE CASE OF COMRADE TULAYEV, by Victor Serge. New York: Doubleday and Company. $3.00. Reviewed by Freda Utley.

This is a novel in the great Russian tradition. Its theme is the modern tragedy of the Old Bolsheviks, faced with the insoluble problem of reconciling their abiding faith in the original Communist ideal with acceptance of the tyranny, injustice and misery of the Soviet world they made. But although Serge was a Marxist, he was also an artist, so that his book transcends the limits of historical materialism. It has a Dostoevskian quality by reason of the author's psychological insight, and concentration on the conflict in the minds of his characters. Serge's disillusionment, like Dostoevski's, covers the whole universe. The Communist mystique takes the place of Christian mysticism in the agony of his heroes. Their inability, or refusal, to abandon their faith in "The Revolution", and "The Party", is far more effective than starvation and physical torture in breaking them to Stalin's will, and inducing them to confess to crimes they never committed. As the noblest of them all, the historian Rublev, says to his interrogators: "I have lived my whole life only for the Party. Sick and degraded though it may be, our Party. I have neither thought nor conscience outside . . . whatever it may do."

Serge's characters include such diverse personalities as a Chief of the Secret Police who is liquidated after he no longer finds it possible to condemn innocent persons to death; the "builder" Makeyev, who also gets liquidated although he had never been guilty of the sin of heresy and had spent ten years "inflicting or swallowing humiliation" believing that "the art of government was to abolish every objection by repression and humiliation"; and the officer Kondratiev, who, after service in Spain, tells Stalin that the Communists lost because of "too little ammunition and too much injustice". Kondratiev is the only one of Serge's principal characters who escapes death or does not commit suicide. Not being an intellectual he could not be broken. Serge's modern counterpart of Dostoevski's Grand Inquisitor says of Kondratiev: "Not a man to flinch; psychologically a soldier rather than an ideologist. Ideologists, being susceptible to the supple and complex dialectics of our period give in more easily; whereas the only thing to do with a soldier is to shoot him and say nothing. Even if he finally promises he will behave before the judges and the audience, you're never sure."

Kondratiev, who tells his persecutors that "someone has got to yell at last, or everything is done for", is sent to manage the Gold Trust in Siberia. All the other Old Bolsheviks perish, precisely because they believe that "No one can resist the Party without going over to the enemy." Even the young Xenia, in Paris, submits after a vain attempt to enlist the aid of French "liberals" in stopping the murder of Rublev. She cannot face the prospect of life, "in this French world where people live only for themselves". "To live for myself, how ridiculous", she exclaims. At the end of the book, the obscure accountant Romachkin, who had unknowingly inspired the murder of Tulayev, says, "I have come to understand that it is too early for justice. What we have to do is work, believe in the Party, feel pity. Since we cannot be just we must feel pity for men."

Serge was a Trotskyist, or heretical Communist, when he completed this book in 1942. It was published in France long before any prominent American publishing house dared sponsor a book so critical of Soviet Russia. FIGARO LITTERAIRE said that "it restores to the novel its importance and dignity". Serge's last book should help destroy the American illusion that the Communist menace will disappear if we give away enough of our substance to raise standards of living everywhere in the world. As he clearly shows, Communism is a fighting faith which is infinitely dangerous because it warps minds and makes the best men serve the bidding of the worst.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED